

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-25 are pending in the subject application.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 13, and 18-25. The changes to the claims made herein do not introduce any new matter.

#### **Claim Amendments**

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to specify that “the notification includes an address of said another print device and an instruction for switching a destination of the two-way communication.” Support for this change can be found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, Paragraph [0052]. Applicant has amended each of independent claims 7, 13, and 18-25 along the same lines that claim 1 has been amended.

#### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 4-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Ferlitsch* (US 2002/0089692 A1). As will be explained in more detail below, the *Ferlitsch* reference does not disclose each and every feature of independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 17-25, as amended herein.

In response to Applicant’s arguments, the Examiner states that “[t]he user will be notified of the destination of the redirected print task, as can be seen in Figure 12 (596) and Figure 13 (626, 632).” Final Office Action at page 2.

In Paragraph [0100], the *Ferlitsch* reference states “the user may be notified 596 of the new destination of the print task.” In Paragraph [0102], the *Ferlitsch* reference states “the SDPC may direct the task 624 to the available device and notify the user of the task destination 626.” And, finally, in Paragraph [0103], the *Ferlitsch* reference states “the print job may be rolled over 630 to the busy printing device and *the user notified 632 of the final destination of the print job.*” [Emphasis added.]

In light of the foregoing, the *Ferlitsch* reference only notifies the user of the destination of a print task or a print job.

On the other hand, the presently claimed configuration notifies the print job submitting device of an instruction for switching a destination of the two-way communication as well as an address of another print device which is the destination of predetermined data, so as to establish the two-way communication between another print device and the print job submitting device. There is no disclosure (or suggestion) of these features in the *Ferlitsch* reference.

Thus, for at least the foregoing reasons, the *Ferlitsch* reference does not disclose each and every feature of the subject matter defined in independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 17-25, as amended herein. With regard to claim 17, Applicant notes that this claim has not been amended herein because the claim as originally filed includes the features that have added to independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 18-25.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 17-25, as amended herein, are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Ferlitsch*. Claims 2 and 4-6, each of which depends from claim 1, claims 8-12, each of which depends from claim 7, and claims 14-16, each of which depends from claim 13, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Ferlitsch* for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding the applicable independent claim.

#### Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ferlitsch*. Claim 3 depends from independent claim 1. As noted above, claim 1 has been amended to specify that “the notification includes an address of said another print device and an instruction for switching a destination of the two-way communication.” As discussed above in connection with the anticipation rejection,

the *Ferlitsch* reference does not disclose (or suggest) the features of the notification specified in present claim 1. Further, nothing in the *Ferlitsch* reference cures this deficiency of the reference relative to the subject matter defined in present claim 1. Accordingly, claim 3 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over *Ferlitsch* for at least the reason that this claim depends from claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reexamination and reconsideration of claims 1-25, as amended herein, and submits that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at **(408) 749-6902**. If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. MIPFP039).

Respectfully submitted,  
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP

/Peter B. Martine/

Peter B. Martine  
Registration No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200  
Sunnyvale, California 94085  
**Customer No. 25920**